

difference between ichnofamilies and 'normal' families lies in Article 23.7.3, which states that names established for an ichnotaxon [at any rank] do not compete in priority with names based on animals themselves.

A further point made by Bertling et al. is that Article 1.3.6 should be revoked; this allows the availability of names established before 1931 that were based on the 'work' of extant (i.e. not extinct) animals. It should however be noted that these non-fossil names do not relate to ichnotaxa and are subject to the Code's normal provisions. The authors state that they are not aware of any such names that are in use: nor am I, but this does not mean that they do not exist! As Bertling et al. say, any names that have passed out of use can be dealt with under the Code in the usual way. The revocation of Article 1.3.6 would also affect other provisions (such as Article 23.3.2.3), and it might raise unforeseen problems of homonymy. As a general principle it is rash to revoke or emend any Code provision unless there is a clear need to do so and the consequences have been taken into account.

Bertling et al. have formed the impression that the Code draws a distinction between fossilized tracks and other 'works' such as galls, coprolites and nests. This is not the case (and the previous edition used the same wordings). I might add that during the formulation of the present Code, many ichnologists made suggestions, and these led inter alia to the requirement that after 2000 new ichnogenera must have a type species (Articles 13.3.3, 66.1). I do not believe that Bertling et al. have demonstrated the need for any changes to the Code's provisions, but it would be helpful if future editions were to include a Glossary entry for 'trace fossil', making it clear that the term is synonymous with 'fossilized work of an animal'. As a member of the former Editorial Committee, I regret that this omission was overlooked during the revision of the Glossary.

In conclusion, I should stress that the references to trace fossils in the Code relate to the works only of *animals* since the remit of the Commission is restricted to zoological nomenclature. The word 'organisms' was used in Article 1.2.1 because the nature of the agent responsible for a trace fossil is often not obvious; if the agent is known not to be animal the Code does not apply.

### **Comments on the neotypification of Protists, especially Ciliates (Protozoa, Ciliophora)**

(General Article; see BZN 59: 165–169; 60: 48–49, 143)

(1) Michael A. Sleight

*Biodiversity and Ecology Division, School of Biological Sciences, University of Southampton, Bassett Crescent East, Southampton SO16 7PX, U.K.*

As the Managing Editor of the *European Journal of Protistology*, I support Wilhelm Foissner's proposal. In his paper, Foissner has written in favour of the practice of neotypification of species, with good quality type material preserved in ways that portray diagnostic features and lodged in collections that permit re-examination and comparison with other specimens. In almost every issue of our journal we publish papers concerned with the description of species which require comparison with inadequately described and untypified species, many of them

originally named in the 19th or early 20th centuries. Often authors conclude that a newly-collected specimen, which can be fully described and preserved, cannot be distinguished from a previously illustrated, but inadequately described, type. Such studies provide a basis for valuable neotypification to stabilise the nomenclature for future work.

However, very often the newly described specimens were not collected in the same location as the originally named organism. By strict application of Article 75.3.6 of the Code, the newly described specimen cannot be regarded as a neotype because it was found in a different locality from the original type. Many, indeed probably most, protozoa are cosmopolitan, and are also very patchily distributed according to their microhabitat requirements. These microhabitats are usually transient, so that the species may have become extinct in the type location long ago, but may be abundant in other places where the conditions now suit them. Therefore, to insist that neotype material of protozoa must be obtained from the locality of original discovery may be unrealistic, or even impossible. The same probably applies to microscopic organisms of other groups occupying similar ecological niches. If this locality restriction is formally waived in the case of protozoa, then more of the taxonomists working with protozoa will be encouraged to deposit useful neotype material of the species they study in suitable type collections. In addition, journal editors will be in a position to encourage, or insist on, such deposition.

(2) Inácio Domingos da Silva Neto

*Instituto de Biologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

I support Wilhelm Foissner's proposal that the neotypes of protists, especially Ciliates, should be freed from the type locality regulation of Article 75.3.6 of the Code.

(3) Jerzy Sikora

*Department of Cell Biology, Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warszawa, Poland*

Wilhelm Foissner presents a convincing argument concerning the neotypification of protists. As Editor of *Acta Protozoologica*, I am interested in clarification of nomenclatural problems. Not being a specialist in systematics and taxonomy, I rely on Dr. Foissner's opinion and expertise. He undoubtedly enjoys the respect of people dealing with protists, especially heterotrophic ciliates. Therefore I consider his appeal to the Commission concerning waiving Article 75.3.6 of the Code to be a reasonable and valuable initiative.

**Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of *Acmaodera* Eschscholtz, 1829 and *Acmaoderella* Cobos, 1955 (Insecta, Coleoptera) by designation of *Buprestis cylindrica* Fabricius, 1775 as the type species of *Acmaodera***  
(Case 3258; see BZN 60: 31–33)

(1) Vladimir Sakalian

*Institute of Zoology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1 Tzar Osvoboditel Blvd., 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria*